



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/015,097	10/29/2001	Robert E. Haines	10012346-1	1532

7590 04/09/2007
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

SALL, EL HADJI MALICK

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2157

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	04/09/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

H1

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/015,097	Applicant(s) HAINES, ROBERT E.	
	Examiner El Hadji M. Sall	Art Unit 2157	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _____ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 December 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 6-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 6-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the correspondence filed on December 8, 2006.

Claim 1 is amended. Claims 1-4 and 6-14 are pending. Claims 1-4 and 6-14 represent dynamic mapping of wireless network devices.

2. ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-4 and 6-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable Kuehnel U.S. 5,787,077 over Jiang 6,741,853.

Kuehnel teaches the invention substantially as claimed including dynamic connection mapping in wireless ATM systems (see abstract).

As to claim 1, Kuehnel teaches a dynamic map of a wireless network, comprising:

representations of a plurality of network devices depicting locations of the network devices relative to a reference point, wherein the locations of the representations are adapted for updating in responses to changes in mapping information contained on a computer-usable medium of one of the network devices without the need for manual intervention (column 8, lines 52-56; see abstract);

wherein the representations comprise visual, audible and/or tactile indicators (figure 6); and wherein the representations provide an indication of at least a relative distance between their respective network device and the reference point (column 4, lines 59-62; column 2, lines 25-36).

Kuehnel fails to teach explicitly a representation of a first network device of the plurality of network devices that is requesting a service on the wireless network; and a representation of a second network device of the plurality of network devices that is capable of providing the requested service; wherein the representation of the first network device is highlighted to differentiate it from representations of other network devices; and wherein the representation of the second network device is highlighted to differentiate it from representations of other network devices that are incapable of providing the requested service.

However, Jiang teaches a representation of a first network device of the plurality of network devices that is requesting a service on the wireless network (column 21, lines 23-26); and

a representation of a second network device of the plurality of network devices that is capable of providing the requested service (column 21, lines 16-19);

wherein the representation of the first network device is highlighted to differentiate it from representations of other network devices (column 5, lines 36-40); and

wherein the representation of the second network device is highlighted to differentiate it from representations of other network devices that are incapable of providing the requested service (column 7, line 64 to column 8, line 7).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Kuehnel in view of Jiang to provide a representation of a first network device of the plurality of network devices that is requesting a service on the wireless network; and a representation of a second network device of the plurality of network devices that is capable of providing the requested service; wherein the representation of the first network device is highlighted to differentiate it from representations of other network devices; and wherein the representation of the second network device is highlighted to differentiate it from representations of other network devices that are incapable of providing the requested service. One would be motivated to do so to allow presenting information in a format suitable to the device being used (abstract).

As to claim 2, Kuehnel teaches the dynamic map of claim 1, wherein at least one of the network devices or the reference point is a transient device of the wireless network (column 2, line 66 to column 3, line 13)).

As to claim 3, Kuehnel teaches the dynamic map of claim 1, further comprising representations of logical connectivity of the plurality of network devices (column 3, lines 18-24).

As to claim 4, Kuehnel teaches the dynamic map of claim 1.

Kuehnel fails to teach explicitly the representations of the plurality of network devices comprise an ordered list of a set of the network devices capable of providing a service requested by another network device of the wireless network, and wherein the order of the list is indicative of a proximity of each of the plurality of network devices to the network device requesting the service.

However, Jiang teaches the representations of the plurality of network devices comprise an ordered list of a set of the network devices capable of providing a service requested by another network device of the wireless network, and wherein the order of the list is indicative of a proximity of each of the plurality of network devices to the network device requesting the service (column 19, lines 39-54; column 15, lines 46-51).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Kuehnel in view of Jiang to provide the representations of the plurality of network devices comprising an ordered list of a set of the network devices capable of providing a service requested by another network device of the wireless network, and wherein the order of the list is indicative of a proximity of each of the plurality of network devices to the network device requesting the service. One would be motivated to do so to allow users ability to request and receive location-based information (column 15, lines 47-48).

As to claim 6, Kuehnel teaches the dynamic map of claim 5, further comprising:
a representation of at least one third network device of the plurality of network devices that is capable of providing the requested service; wherein the representation of the at least one third network device is highlighted to differentiate it from representations of other network devices that are incapable of providing the requested service (column 6, line 64 to column 7, line 5);

As to claim 7, Kuehnel teaches the dynamic map of claim 6, wherein the second network device is a device most closely matching a selection criteria to provide the requested service and wherein the highlighting of the representation of the second network device further differentiates it from a representation of each third network device (column 11, lines 36-40).

As to claim 8, Kuehnel teaches the dynamic map of claim 5, further comprising:
a representation of a path between the first network device and the second network device (column 3, lines 8-13).

As to claim 9, Kuehnel teaches the dynamic map of claim 8, wherein the representation of the path between the first network device and the second network device accounts for obstructions between the first network device and the second network device (column 3, line 60 to column 4, line 3).

As to claim 10, Kuehnel teaches the dynamic map of claim 8, further comprising:
a representation of a path between the first network device and each of the third network devices (column 3, lines 8-13).

As to claim 11, Kuehnel teaches the dynamic map of claim 10, wherein the representation of the path between the first network device and each of the third second network devices accounts for obstructions between the first network device and the third network devices (column 3, line 60 to column 4, line 3).

As to claim 12, Kuehnel teaches the dynamic map of claim 1, further comprising a directional indicator indicative of a direction between a first network device requesting a

Art Unit: 2157

service on the wireless network and a second network device selected to provide the requested service (figure 6).

As to claim 13, Kuehnel teaches the dynamic map of claim 1, further comprising a distance indicator indicative of a distance between a first network device requesting a service on the wireless network and a second network device selected to provide the requested service (column 7, line 57 to column 8, line 10).

As to claim 14, Kuehnel teaches the dynamic map of claim 13, wherein the distance indicator accounts for obstructions in a path between the first network device and the second network device (column 3, line 60 to column 4, line 3).

4. Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to El Hadji M Sall whose telephone number is 571-272-4010. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on 571-272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-4010.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the


Art Unit: 2157

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

El Hadji Sall

Patent Examiner

Art Unit: 2157



ARIO ETIENNE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100